DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 673 PS 013 327

AUTHOR Snow, Charles W.
TITLE Characteristics of Federally Funded In-Service Day Care Training Programs.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southern Association on Children Under Six (Tulsa, OK, March 17, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum; *Day Care; *Delivery Systems; Early Childhood Education; Federal Programs; *Financial Support; *Inservice Education; National Surveys; Participant Characteristics; Postsecondary Education; Program Evaluation; *Teaching Methods; *Training

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the characteristics of inservice day care training programs in the United States. The study covers programs which were partially or totally supported with federal funds. Questionnaires were sent to 161 programs which were in operation during the 1980-1981 fiscal year. Responses were obtained from 70 programs representing 23 states. The results of the study are discussed in terms of (1) program sponsors, (2) funding sources, (3) training staff, (4) target population, (5) delivery models and strategies, (6) teaching methods, (7) curriculum, (8) training materials, and (9) evaluation and monitoring. Responses in each category are analyzed and summarized in terms of common features, program differences, and overall trends. A list of training materials developed by the various projects is included in the appendix. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED225673

CHARACTERISTICS OF FEDERALLY FUNDED IN-SERVICE DAY CARE TRAINING PROGRAMS

Charles W. Snow
Department of Child Development
and Family Relations
School of Home Economics
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

Southern Association on Children Under Six
Annual Conference

Tulsa, Oklahoma
March, 1982

PS013327

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Charles W. Snow
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

Snow, Charles W. Characteristics of Federally Funded In-Service Day Care Training Programs. Southern Association on Children Under Six Annual Conference. Tulsa, Oklahoma, March 17-20, 1982.

The purpose of this study was to assess the characteristics of in-service day care training programs in the United States. The study covers programs which were partially or totally supported with federal funds. Questionnaires were sent to 161 programs which were in operation during the 1980-81 fiscal year. Responses were obtained from 70 programs representing 23 states.

The results of the study are discussed in terms of (1) program sponsors; (2) funding sources; (3) training staff; (4) target population; (5) delivery models and strategies; (6) teaching methods; (7) curriculum; (8) training materials; and (9) evaluation and monitoring. Responses in each category are analyzed and summarized in terms of common features; program differences and overall trends. A list of training materials developed by the various projects is included in the Appendix.

PS013327

The importance of specialized training for day care personnel was emphasized in the results of the National Day Care Study (Ruopp, et al., 1979). In recent years a number of federally funded in-service training programs for day care workers have been conducted throughout the United States. However, relatively little information has been published on the characteristics of the programs. Mathis and Kilmer (1971) recommended that a detailed nationwide study be conducted to determine the characteristics and availability of day care training programs. A review of the literature (Snow, Note 1) supports the conclusion that the need for such a study continues to exist.

The present study was designed to assess the characteristics of in-service day care training programs in the United States. The study is limited to programs which have been partially or totally supported with federal, state, or local funds. The basic purpose of the study is to obtain information about program delivery models, goals and objectives, teaching methods, curriculum, funding, monitoring and evaluation, as well as other program characteristics. Theoretically, such information will be useful in planning training services in the future.

Methodology

The preliminary phase of the study, which began in April, 1981, consisted of efforts to identify as many in-service day care training programs in the United States as possible. The primary target group was projects supported through federal (Title XX) funds. A questionnaire requesting the names and addresses of day care training providers was mailed to the designated Title XX State Agency Director in each of the 48 continental United States.

Responses were received from 42 of the states. Out of the states responding, only 34 offered in-service training to day care providers through Title XX and other funds. Eight states indicated that no money was available from any source for funding day care training services. The 34 states in which day care training was provided, listed a total of 217 training programs. However, mailing addresses were provided for only 161 training providers. The target sample for the study thus consisted of 161 projects representing 34 states.

The preliminary phase of the study also involved the development of a questionnaire which could be used to obtain information from the training projects. The first draft of a questionnaire was developed and mailed to 10 training projects for response and comment. The 7 responses obtained in the pilot survey were used to revise the questionnaire. The final draft consisted of a total of 30 questions.[1] In order to minimize the response time, multiple-choice answers were provided for the questions when it was appropraite. The choices were developed and refined on the basis of information obtained in the pilot survey.

The questionnaire was mailed to the remaining 151 projects in August of 1981. Twelve questionnaires were returned by the postal service marked insufficient address. A total of 70 completed questionnaires were eventually returned from 23 states, representing a response rate of 50.4 percent. Although the response is acceptable, it is not exceptionally high. The recent federal budget cuts in funding for training probably had a negative influence on interest in participating in the survey.

Results

The responses to the questionnaire were coded and tabulated by computer process. Descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions and measures of

[1] A copy of the questionnaire is available from the author upon request.

central tendency were used primarily in the analysis of the data. The process of data analysis was complicated by the variability of replies and the failure of some of the respondents to answer all questions. The results of the study will be presented in relation to the following topics: training providers, funding, training methods, curriculum, training materials, evaluation and monitoring, conclusions and implication. The data will be discussed in terms of common features, program differences, and general trends.

Training Providers

The responses to the questionnaire reveal that in-service day care training programs are operated by a variety of organizations. The training providers are identified by type of sponsor affiliation in Table 1. State and local government agencies represent the largest percentage (37.1%) of training providers. Two-year and four-year institutions of higher education account for the second largest number (34.3%) of providers. The remaining programs were operated by non-profit corporations or associations, community action agencies and the cooperatve extension service.

The number of years which the projects had been in operation ranged from less than one year to eleven years. The majority of projects (50.1%) had operated for a period of time which ranged from less than one year to four years. Several projects (29.1%) had been in operation from four to eight years, while only nine percent of the programs had a longevity of eight to sixteen years. Two of the projects did not specify the number of years of project operation.

An attempt was made to determine whether the type of training provider and the amount of time of project operation were variables which influenced the responses. Chi-square analyses were performed. However, the expected cell frequencies violated the assumptions of the test, so the results were not accepted as valid. Further attempts will be made to reclassify the data and produce

categories in which the expected frequencies are adequate. It is tentatively concluded that due to the variety of responses to most of the questions and the relatively small sample size, it is not feasible to determine whether the responses varied significantly by project sponsor and longevity.

Funding

Forty-nine of the projects (70%) were funded exclusively through a combination of federal Title XX funds and state or local matching funds. The typical combination was 75% Title XX and 25% local matching funds, although some programs reported a different formula such as 70% federal and 30% local. Thirteen programs (18.6%) utilized Title XX and state or local matching funds plus support from at least one other source, such as CETA, Title I, Community Development funds, foundations and corporations. Only eight programs (11.4%) did not utilize any Title XX funds. Out of the group which did not receive Title XX support, three projects were funded through a variety of other federal and local programs such as Head Start, Vocational Home Economics, Department of Education and the U. S. Department of Agriculture. The remaining five programs identified a combination of state and local funds as the only sources of support.

The projects were asked to indicate the total amount of their current project budget along with sub-totals for personnel and project operations. Twenty-nine of the projects (41.4%) did not indicate budget totals and 38 (54.3%) did not provide the amounts for the sub-totals. The 41 projects (58.6%) which provided budget totals were funded with amounts ranging from $500 to $2,500,000. The average budget was $90,103, while the median budget was $15,653. It should be noted, however, that the mean was inflated by the one $2,500,000 budget. (The next highest budget was $930,000.) The total funding for the 41 projects responding to the question was $7,807,179. The 32 projects (45.7%) which provided budget

sub-totals, utilized 68.2 percent of their funds for personnel and 31.8 percent for all other expenditures.

The programs were asked if continued funding was expected after the current budget year. Twenty-nine (41.4%) of the providers anticipated that funding would not be available, or that there was a low probability for future funding. Out of this group, three of the respondents reported that funding had been terminated during the current budget year. Twenty-three of the programs (32.9%) expected to have their funding renewed. The remaining 18 projects (25.7%) were uncertain about the probability of continued funding.

Training Staff

The number of full-time training staff employed by the projects ranged from 0 to 24, with an average of 2.4 and a median of 1.5. However, it is interesting to note that 22 of the projects (31.4%) reported no full-time staff members. The majority of the projects apparently relied heavily upon part-time personnel for staffing. The number of part-time staff ranged from 0 to 75. The average was 3.9 and the median was 1.04. Twenty-nine of the projects (41.4%) did not utilize part-time staff. Most of the training programs (74%) employed consultants or experts to lead specific workshops or other training events. The daily fee paid the training experts ranged from $23 to $300. The average amount was $58, while $100 was the amount most frequently paid.

The training projects were staffed with people from a wide variety of educational backgrounds. Detailed information is presented in Table 2. Educational levels ranged from staff with doctorates to staff with less than a bachelors degree. The degree most frequently identified was the masters, although it cannot be concluded that most of the training staff held a masters degree. At first glance, it is surprising that more than one-half of the programs had staff with

less than a bachelors degree. However, it appears logical to assume that these positions, in most instances, represented clerical and support personnel.

The educational specialization of the training staff included a relatively wide range of fields. The majors most frequently identified were early childhood/elementary education, child development and special education respectively. A variety of other fields including sociology, business, secondary education, political science and home economics were represented.

Training Population

An attempt was made to determine the type of staff, geographical area, the type of day care facility, ages of children served, the educational level of trainees, and the number of training participants served by the projects. Information relative to these questions is summarized in Table 3.

For the most part, it appears that the training programs were set up to serve a rather diverse target population of personnel involved with day care. Approximately three-fourths of the projects provided training for direct caregivers plus staff members in one or more additional position. Some of the programs (approximately 25.6%), however, limited their clientele to one specific type of trainee, such as directors or teachers. The programs primarily offered training to staff in family day care homes, day care centers, or a combination of both. While none of the programs exclusively served facilities caring for children with special needs, approximately one-third of the respondents include staff from those centers in their training activities.

The training population served by the programs appears to be relatively well balanced geographically. Approximately 39 percent of the projects served either urban or suburban areas or a combination of both. While only 10 percent of the programs were designed specifically to serve a rural area, 43 percent of

the programs included rural locations in their training territory. The trainees provided care for infants, toddlers, preschool, as well as, school age children. Most of the training projects (71.4%) served personnel who work with all of these ages.

The respondents were asked to estimate the average educational level of the trainees which they served. The estimates ranged from some high school through four years of college. Fifty percent of the programs estimated that the average trainee had at least a high school diploma. Approximately one-fourth of the programs served trainees with estimated average educational levels which included some college.

Fifty-three (75.7%) of the programs provided information about the number of individuals who participated in their training activities. The numbers of participants for all training events ranged from 12 to 6404, with an average of 892. The cummulative total of participants for all training provided by the 53 projects amounted to 47,300. The above numbers represent a duplicated count in which individuals could be counted more than once for separate training events. The unduplicated count, i.e. the number of different individuals participating in all training events, ranged from 6 to 1300 with a mean of 293. The cummulative unduplicated count for all training provided by the reporting projects was 14,745.

The respondents were also asked to provide the total number of hours for all training activities during the past 12 months. The 47 projects which provided this information had a combined total of 57,068 training hours. The invididual project totals varied widely from 6 to 7,000 hours. The average was 1,214 hours of training.

The respondents were asked if any information about the cost of training per trainee had been developed for their project. Only 27 (38.6%) of the respondents indicated that information about training costs was available. The second

part of the question requested the specific amount along with the basis on which it was calculated. Twelve projects gave specific costs which ranged from $6 to $822 per trainee. A few of the projects (10) indicated how the cost was determined. The procedure used by 5 of the projects was simply to divide the total budget by the number of participants. To determine the cost of per training hour, 3 of the projects multiplied the number of participants times the total hours of training and divided the product into the total budget. In 2 instances, the cost of training was calculated on a monthly basis.

Goals and Objectives

The responses to the questionnaire indicate that the goals and objectives of the training projects were relatively similar. The following three objectives were common to a large majority of projects:

1. Skill and knowledge development. To help participants obtain specific knowledge and skills relative to day care (97.1%).
2. Attitude change. To help participants develop a more enthusiastic and positive attitude toward their work (84.3%).
3. Building self-esteem. To help participants develop a more positive self-image as a day care worker (84.3%).

An additional objective identified by 25 of the projects (35.7%) was to develop a specific set of training materials for use and distribution by other agencies. Numerous other objectives specific to individual projects were also identified. The responses included statements such as "to provide materials through a lending library/resource center," "to help centers meet licensing standards," and "to increase awareness of legislative issues."

The majority of the projects (73%) based their training objectives on the Child Development Associate (CDA) competency areas to some degree. Two of the projects utilized the CDA competencies to a large extent. However, 19 of the

respondents reported that their project objectives were not based upon the CDA competencies at all.

Delivery Models, Strategies and Teaching Methods

The term "delivery model" is used to refer to the basic modality whereby training is delivered to the target population. It is the basic training activity or event for which eligible clientele register or enroll. The term "delivery strategy" is used to mean the same thing and is used interchangeably with "delivery model." Teaching methods refer to the procedures used by the trainers/teachers in presenting information to the participants and engaging them in the learning process.

The projects utilized a variety of delivery models in providing training to their clientele. The specific delivery strengths are identified in Table 4 along with their respective rankings according to frequency of use, popularity and effectiveness. While none of the projects utilized all of the models, all of the projects reported utilizing more than one approach. The three most frequently used delivery models were on-site visits to day care facilities, one-day workshops, and the development of specific training materials. It is surprising that the development of specific training materials was ranked number three in frequency of use since only 25 of the projects included materials development as an objective. It is possible that the respondents interpreted "the development of specific training materials," to refer to a teaching method rather than a delivery strategy.

The three most popular and well received training strategies were one-day workshops, on-site visits, and short courses. The same three strategies were also ranked as the most effective, with one exception. Regular curriculum courses tied with short courses for third place. The "development of specific materials" which ranked third in frequency of use was rated 4th in the most popular category and fifth in the most effective categories.

The teaching methods utilized by the programs are listed in Table 5 according to the frequency of use in training events. The methods which were identified follow rather traditional patterns as would be expected. The three most frequently used methods were: (1) lectures, disucssion, questions and exchange of ideas, (2) use of audio-visuals, and (3) handouts of printed materials.

Curriculum

The subject areas covered in the training sessions offered by the projects encompassed a wide range of topics. A list of the curriculum areas identified by the programs is included in Table 6, in order of frequency of listing. Child development, health, food and nutrition, safety, parent involvement, behavior management, and daily planning are areas which were included by 90 percent or more of the programs

A majority of projects offered some type credit to the training participants. Sixteen of the programs (27%) indicated that credit is awarded for all training. Thirty-one of the projects (44%) awarded credit for some, but not all training activities. Credit toward a college degree was offered by 32 programs. Continuing education units, high school credits, or certificates which applied toward meeting state licensing requirements were awarded by several (40%) projects. In addition, some of the programs (41%) provided assistance to trainees in obtaining competencies for the CDA credential. Seventeen projects reported a combined total of 107 candidates who had recieved the CDA credential. The number of CDA's ranged from 1 to 8, with an average of 6.3 for the 17 projects.

Training Materials

The respondents were asked to list training materials such as booklets, self-instructional packets, handouts, and audio-visuals which their project had developed for use in training sessions and/or distribution to trainees. Not all of the projects provided this information, but a variety of material was identified.

A list of the titles along with the project name, address and the conditions under which the material may be available is provided in Appendix A.

The projects were also asked to identify the materials and resources available from commercial publishers and other sources which they found most useful and would recommend to other day care training programs. Due to extensive numbers of titles itemized by the respondents, it is not possible to provide a list of the materials in this report. However, a bibliography of day care training materials will be compiled on the basis of the responses and published in a separate paper.

Evaluation and Monitoring

Federal guidelines require that training contractors utilizing Title XX funds conduct some type of periodic self-evaluation of their programs. The evaluation procedures identified by the various projects are listed in Table 7 according to frequency of use. With four exceptions, all of the projects utilized some type of evaluation. Many of the programs used more than one method. The easiest methods, such as rating scales and satisfaction reports were used most frequently. The most difficult evaluation procedures such as the measurement of change in children served by the trainees were used by the fewest number of projects.

Training projects utilizing federal funds are also required to go through a periodic monitoring process by the funding agency. Thirty-one (44%) of the respondents indicated that their projects were monitored on an annual basis. Eighteen (25.7%) of the projects reported that monitoring occurs more frequently than once each year. Two of the projects (2.9%) were monitored once every two or three years, while eleven (15.7%) projects were monitored on an irregular basis. Five projects (7.1%) had never been monitored.

The respondents were asked to rate the success of their project on the basis of the results of the most recent evaluation. Twenty-eight projects (40%) were rated as "very successful", 28 (40%) as "successful", and 5 (7%) as "somewhat

successful." None of the projects reported less than successful or inconclusive training results. Seven projects did not respond to the question and two indicated that their training had not yet been evaluated.

Summary, Conclusions and Implications

In looking at the picture of in-service day care training in the United States presented in this report, the following characteristics appear:

1. Training is provided by a variety of sources. State and local agencies have been extensively involved as training service providers, as well as funding channels and sources for the sponsors. It was surprising that institutions of higher education accounted for no more than one-third of the projects represented in the study.

2. Day care training projects, for the most part, tend to remain in operation for a relatively brief period of time. Only a few projects reported a history of more than eight years.

3. The average day care training project budget was $90,103, but the budgets varied extensively from a low of $500 to a high of $2,500,000. Day care training providers have apparently been rather resourceful in drawing upon funds from a variety of sources. While the study focused on Title XX programs, a number of other funding sources were identified by the project sponsors. However, judging from the extent of the uncertainity which was expressed about continued funding, many, if not most, of the projects will either be funded at reduced levels, or will be terminated.

4. The day care training projects relied heavily upon part-time personnel. As a group, the programs were staffed with people of varying educational levels and specializations.

5. Generally, it appears that the projects were geographically well distributed among rural, urban and suburban areas. Training services were provided to day caregivers who serve children of varying ages in family day care homes, day care centers, as well as some specialized facilities. The programs averaged serving 293 individuals and providing 1,21[illegible] hours of training.

6. The goals and objectives of the training programs appear to be specific and clearly defined. Judging from the topics which were identified, the training curriculum was practical and utilitarian. Teaching methods followed rather predictable patterns, and there is no reason to conclude that they were not appropriate.

7. The use of on-site visits, one-day workshops, and the materials model were the three strategies used most frequently in delivering training. The projects reported that the three most well received and effective delivery strategies were one-day workshops, on-site visits, and short courses.

8. On the basis of their self-evaluations, the projects were rated as successful. The evaluation procedures ranged from informal "word of mouth" feedback reports to more elaborate pre- and post-test assessments.

The present study has yielded considerable descriptive information about in-service day care training programs in the United States which were in operation during the 1980-81 fiscal year. However, there are some gaps in the data which were obtained and are reflected in the report. The task of determining how some of the variables influence day care training remains. For example, are there any quantitative, as well as qualitative differences in training provided by varying sources such as 2 year institutions of higher education versus government agencies? Information is also needed to assess the relative cost-effectiveness of different delivery models.

It appears that we are at the end of an era of federal funding for in-service day care training programs. This means that if training programs are to continue in existence, they will need to be even more innovative and resourceful in finding alternate sources of funding. It will also be important to identify the most efficient and effective ways of providing training services with fewer dollars without sacrificing quality.

Reference Notes

1. Snow, C., In-service day care training programs: A review and analysis. Manuscript accepted for publication in Child Care Quarterly.

References

Mathis, M.E., and Kilmer S., Training programs for child care personnel. Vol. 1. Final report: Part IX. Minneapolis, Minn.: Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068 197).

Ruopp, R., Travers, T., Glantz, F., and Coelen, C., Children at the center: Final report of the national day care study: Summary, Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.: ABT Associates, 1979.

TABLES

TABLE 1

TRAINING PROVIDERS BY AFFILIATION

Affiliation	No.	Pct.	Com. Pct.
4 year public university or college	12	17.1	17.1
4 year private university or college	3	4.3	21.4
2 year public college or technical school	7	10.0	31.4
2 year private college or technical school	2	2.9	34.3
Community action agency	2	2.9	37.2
Non-profit corporation or association	17	24.3	61.5
State or local government agency	26	37.1	98.6
Cooperative extension service	1	1.4	100.0
Totals	70	100.0	

TABLE 2

TRAINING STAFF BY EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Degree	Pct. of Programs With 1 or more	No. For All Programs Range	Mean
Doctorate	25.7	0-4	.47
Masters	67.1	0-14	2.01
Bachelors	10.0	0-10	.30
Less than bachelors	52.9	0-12	1.29
Graduate Assistants	28.6	0-4	.51
Specialization			
Early Childhood/Elementary Ed.	54.3	0-11	1.56
Child Development	49.6	0-12	1.06
Special Education	8.6	0-3	.13
Other (Soci, Ed.Ad., Sec.Ed., Bus., Pol.Sc., Adult Ed., Speech, Home Ec., Montessori	34.3	0.6	.70

TABLE 3
CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAINING POPULATION

A. Type of Staff Served	NO.	PCT.
All staff in the target day care facilities	29	41.4
Teaching/caregiving staff only	13	18.7
Directors only	1	1.4
Caregivers plus directors	10	14.3
State and local social services agency personnel	5	7.1
All of the above	4	5.7
Teaching staff, directors, plus state and local social services personnel	5	7.1
Teaching staff plus state and local social services agency personnel	2	2.9
Other (parents, high school and college students)	1	1.4
Totals	70	100.0

B. Type of Facility	NO.	PCT.
Family day care homes	15	21.4
Day care centers	18	25.9
Family homes and day care centers	7	10.0
Day care facilities serving children with special needs	0	0.0
All of the above	22	31.4
Combination of the above	6	8.6
No response	2	2.9
Totals	70	100.0

C. Geographical Area	NO.	PCT.
Rural	7	10.0
Urban	12	17.1
Suburban	2	2.9
Urban and suburban	13	18.6
Rural and suburban	6	8.6
Rural and urban	9	12.9
Rural, urban, and suburban	20	28.6
No response	1	1.4
Totals	70	100.0

D. Ages of Children Served by Trainees	NO.	PCT.
Infants/toddlers	0	0.0
Preschool children	4	5.7
School-age children	2	2.9
All of the above	50	71.4
Combination of the above	12	17.1
No response	2	2.9
Totals	70	100.0

E. Estimated Average Educational Level of Trainees	NO.	PCT.
Some high school	9	12.9
High school graduate	35	50.0
Some college	17	24.3
2-year college degree	3	4.3
4-year college degree	4	5.7
No response	2	2.9
Totals	70	100.0

TABLE 4

TRAINING STRATEGIES

RANKED AS TO FREQUENCY OF USE, POPULARITY, AND EFFECTIVENESS

Strategy	Frequency of Use			Most Popular			Most Effective		
	No.	Pct.	Rank	No.	Pct.	Rank	No.	Pct.	Rank
On-Site Visits	54	77.1	1	39	55.7	2.0	28	40.0	2.0
One-Half Day Workshops or Less	4	5.7	12	4	5.7	10.5	3	4.3	10.0
One Day Workshops	50	71.4	2	43	61.4	1.0	33	47.1	1.0
Two-Day Workshops	16	22.9	9	4	5.7	10.5	3	4.3	10.0
One-Week Workshops	6	8.6	11	0	0.0	13.0	0	0.0	13.0
Study/Observation Visits	13	18.6	10	6	8.6	9.0	5	7.1	8.0
Regular Curriculum Courses	27	38.6	6	15	21.4	4.0	12	17.1	3.5
Short Courses	28	40.0	5	16	22.9	3.0	12	17.1	3.5
Correspondence Courses	3	4.3	13	1	1.4	12.0	1	1.4	12.0
Provision of Self-Instructional Materials to Trainees	24	34.3	7	6	8.6	8.0	9	12.9	6.0
Development of Specific Training Materials	42	60.0	3	14	20.0	5.0	11	15.7	5.0
Toy Lending Library	23	32.9	8	8	11.4	6.0	8	11.4	7.0
Instructional Materials Lending Library	33	47.1	4	7	10.0	7.0	5	7.1	8.0

TABLE 5

TEACHING METHODS

RANKED ACCORDING TO FREQUENCY OF USE

Method	Used By: No.	Pct.	Rank
Lectures, discussion, questions, and exchange of ideas	70	100.0	1
Handouts of printed materials	63	90.0	2
Use of films, video-tapes, and other audio-visuals	60	85.7	3
Model/demonstrations	53	75.7	4
Materials construction	47	67.1	5
Role play/simulated experiences	44	62.9	6
Action games, songs, etc.	43	61.4	7
Self-instructional packages of materials	31	44.3	8
Guided observations	30	42.9	9
Other ("Hands on" workshops; case studies)	4	5.7	10

TABLE 6

CURRICULUM AREAS

RANKED ACCORDING TO FREQUENCY OF USE

Topic	No.	Used By Pct.	Rank
Child development	70	100.0	1.0
Behavior management	66	94.3	2.0
Parent involvement	65	92.9	3.0
Daily planning	63	90.0	5.0
Food and nutrition	63	90.0	5.0
Health and safety	63	90.0	5.0
Curriculum	60	85.7	7.0
Room arrangement	58	82.9	8.5
Working with infants/toddlers	58	82.9	8.5
Teacher-made materials	57	81.4	10.0
Abuse and neglect	51	72.9	11.0
School-age day care	50	71.4	12.5
Family day care	50	71.4	12.5
Orientation to child care	46	65.7	14.0
Assessment and evaluation of children	42	60.0	15.5
Developing the outdoor environment	42	60.0	15.5
Field trips	41	58.6	17.0
Day care administration	40	57.1	18.0
Working with handicapped children	39	55.7	19.0
Mainstreaming	28	40.0	20.0
Other (problem solving, creative play, teaching techniques, staff development, stress management, etc.)	16	22.9	21.0

TABLE 7

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

RANKED ACCORDING TO FREQUENCY OF USE

Procedure	No.	Used by Pct.	Rank
Measures of satisfaction of trainees (rating scales, questionnaires, etc.)	53	75.7	1.0
Trainee self-assessment of knowledge and skills gained	36	51.4	2.0
Pre-test and post-test assessment of knowledge, attitude and/or skills gained by participants	32	45.7	3.5
Ratings of trainees by supervisor/employer	32	45.7	3.5
Quantitative measures of training provided (number of participants trained, events conducted, etc.)	30	42.9	5.0
Measurement of change in classroom environment using a pre and post assessment scale	19	27.1	6.0
Measurement of change in children served by training participants	8	11.4	8.0
Other (on-site observations, trainee and trainer perception tests; follow-up telephone calls; informal discussion with participants; "word of mouth;" evaluation by funding agency)	13	18.6	7.0
None	4	5.7	

APPENDIX A: TRAINING MATERIALS *

Brazoria County Day Care
P.O. Box 1609
Alvin, Texas
Stress Training (Books, Audiovisuals)
Contact: Texas Department of Human Resources
P.O. Box 2960
Austin, Texas 78769

Center for Child and Family Development
555 Constitution, Room 221
University of Oklahoma 73037
Behavior and Guidance for Young Children
Ways to Help Your Child Learn
Twenty-Page Pamphlets (50¢ each)

Central Child Care of West Virginia
410½ Elizabeth Street
P.O. Box 5339
Charleston, West Virginia 25311
Summertime Activities for Children 6-12 Years Old in Day Care Programs ($3.00)
What to Expect From an Infant 0-12 Months (50¢)
What to Expect From Two's, Three's and Four's (50¢)
What Do You Do When... (50¢)
Activities for Day Care Workers (60¢)
Arts and Crafts Activities for Child Care Workers (50¢)
Construction Corner (40¢)
Free Form Materials (50¢)
Sand and Water Play (50¢)
Your Imaginative Play Area (50¢)

Central Virginia Child Development Association
P.O. Box 424
Charlottesville, Virginia
Family Day Care Training Materials (Course Outlines and Handouts) ($45.00)

Child Care Association of Metropolitan Dallas
5415 Maple Avenue, Suite 322
Dallas, Texas 75235
Programs and Training Packets (All self-instructional):
Getting Ready for School
Transitions
Assessment and Planning-Developing Curriculum
From Discipline to Guidance-The Role of the Teacher in the Child's Development of Inner Control
Children's Program Audit
(All Possibly for Sale)

*Prices and availability of materials are subject to change.

Child Day Care Association
915 Olive Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Insurance Manual for Day Care Centers (Booklet) ($5.00)
Starting a Day Care Center (Paper) ($2.00)
Curriculum Models (Paper) (Not for sale)
Criteria for Evaluation of Centers (Paper) (Not for sale)
Early Childhood Program Directory (Booklet) ($2.00)

Children's Center of St. Johnsbury
St. Johnsbury, Vermont 05819

Teaching Through A Responsing Environment (Book and Slides)
(Material owned by the State of Vermont) (Will Loan)

City College Day Care Training Program
Convent Avenue at 138th Street
New York, New York 10031

Mathematics is More Than Counting (Pamphlet) (Not for sale)
A Tree Science Walk (Pamphlet) (Not for sale)
A Notebook on Planning and Curriculum for After-School Programs (Booklet)
(Not for sale)
From Mud to Pie: Children Learn Through Cooking (Slides and Handbook)
(Not for sale)
Transitions Periods (Videotape and Handbook) (Not for sale)

Fairfax County Office for Children
10396 Democracy Avenue
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Family Day Care Guide for Training (Manuals for Training) ($4.00)

Flint Genesee County 4-C Program
202 East Boulevard Drive Suite 220
Flint, Michigan 48503

Children and Divorce: A Parent's Guide (Pamphlet) (Not for sale)
Center for Cultural Awareness Through Play and Exploration (Pamphlet)
(Not for sale)
A Guide to Children's Services in Genesee County (Pamphlet) (Not for sale)
I Can Do That! (Activities Handbook) (Not for sale)
Death and Young Children (Booklist) (Not for sale)
Infants-What to Expect (Pamphlet) (Not for sale)
Family Day Care Activities (Handout) (Not for sale)
Toddlers-Growth and Development (Pamphlet) (Not for sale)

Kent County 4-C
1432 Wealthy SE
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

Practical Considerations of Running a Family Day Care Home
(Handbook) (90¢ + Postage)

Lamar University
Child Care Technology Program
P.O. Box 10043
Beaumont, Texas 77710

Framework for Training: A Report of the Texas Early Childhood Careers Recognition Council
The Texas Department of Community Affairs Editors: Karen Bordelon, Norma Stone, Deanna Tate
P.O. Box 13166 Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Michigan Department of Social Services
Day Care Provider Training Program
Wayne State University
Center for Urban Studies
5229 Cass Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48202

WSU Curriculum Models (Printed Materials) (Not for sale)

Millersville State College
Research and Learning Center
Millersville, Pennsylvania 17551

In-Service Manual for Teachers (Booklet) (Not for sale, but will loan)

Office for Young Children
701 North Logan Street Suite #435
Lansing, Michigan 48914

(All Available for Mailing Costs Only):
Handbook for Parents
Resource Guide for New Parents
Caring for Infants and Toddlers
Business Aspects of Family Day Care
Something for Nothing

Cookbook for a Small World (Booklet) (80¢)
Toy Making Booklet (Booklet) ($1.00)
Field Trip Guide (Booklet) (20¢)
Rainy Day Activities (Booklet) (25¢)

Ohio Department of Public Welfare
Bureau of Children, Children's Services
30 East Broad Street, 30th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Trainer's Manual for the Instruction of Home Child Care Providers
Family Day Care Provider Handbook

PERS
P.O. Box 29123
San Antonio, Texas 78240

A Standard Training Program for Infant and Toddler Caregivers (Kit and Trainer's Manual) ($25.00)

Making Teaching-Learning Episodes Culturally Special for Preschool Children (Printed Kit) ($25.00)

Provider Staff Training Project
McLennan Community College
1400 College Drive
Waco, Texas 76708

Preschool Reading Program (Modules and Tapes)

Handouts (Numerous ones) (Not for sale)

Preschool Assessment Instruments (Training Packets and Workshop Materials (Not for sale)

Rainbow Fleet
3014 Paseo
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73103

Several one-page instructions for making own materials in areas of: Infant-Toddler, Sensory Perception, Math, Language, Arts and Crafts, Music, Field Trips, etc. (Will loan)

Nutrition Handbook (Will loan)

Resources for Quality Child Care
Incarnate Word College
San Antonio, Texas 78209

(All mimeo materials) (Will loan)

Books and Storytelling

Easy Games for Afterschoolers

Multicultural Holidays

Music is More than a Bunch of Notes

Taking Learning Centers Outdoors

Science Activities for Children of all Ages

Puppets and Flannelboards

Language Arts

Tidewater Child Care Association
2115 High Street
Portsmouth, Virginia 23704

Caring for Children (Videotape-TV Series) ($100.00/set)
Beginning a Day Care Center (Information Packet) ($25.00)
Home Day Care (Information Packet) ($10.00)
Budgeting, Money Management and Bookkeeping for Day Care Centers (Booklet) ($5.00)
Developing Portable Learning Centers (Booklet) ($1.00)
Holiday Music for Young Children-Hallowe'en, Thanksgiving and Christmas (Workshop handouts) ($1.00)
Music and Self-Esteem (Workshop handout) (50¢)
It's a Small World-International Activities for Young Children (Workshop handout) (50¢)
Holiday Fun-Seasonal Ideas for Day Care (Booklet) ($1.00)

UNO Center for Applied Urban Research
Omaha, Nebraska

Child Development Through Home Made Play Materials (Home Study Course) ($20.00)
Child Guidance in Day Care Homes (Home Study Course) ($20.00)
Nutrition for Children in Day Care (Home Study Course) ($20.00)
Coping with Probem Behavior (Workshop) (Free)
Bumps, Burns, Bruises and Other Emergencies (Workshop) (Free)
Home Made Play Materials (Workshop) (Free)
Nutrition (Workshop) (Free)
Parental Involvement (Workshop) (Free)
Snappy Snacks and Lively Lunches (Workshop) (Free)
Techniques of Child Guidance (Workshop) (Free)
Day Care for Toddlers (Workshop) (Free)
Practical Skills for Administrators (Workshop) ($4.50)
Safe Transportation of Children (Workshop) ($4.50)

Virginia Department of Welfare
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23288

Family Day Care (Booklist) (Will loan)
Virginia Day Care Skills (Manual for Training) (Will loan)
Ready, Set, Go (Handbook) (Will loan)
Leader's Manual (Training Manual) (Will loan)